Mrs. Amy Ponzio-Belyea Nova Techno Corporation

-3-

October 23, 2003

were all above the MCL for total chromium, but not for hexavalent chromium. These results for total chromium were concentrations of 80 $\mu g/L$ in December 2001, 280 $\mu g/L$ in March 2002, 89 $\mu g/L$ in January 2003, and 240 $\mu g/L$ in September 2003. Depth to groundwater in monitoring well number MW3 was 11.98 feet bgs in January 2003, and 14.65 feet bgs in September 2003.

REMEDIATION

The removal of hexavalent chromium impacted soil at the facility was conducted between August 18, 2003, and August 28, 2003. During this time the following remedial activities occurred: concrete removal from around and between the two former plating tank secondary containment vaults, demolition and removal of the two concrete vaults, and excavation of hexavalent chromium-containing soil. The excavated soil was temporarily stockpiled on plastic sheeting within the building before being loaded into trucks for the off-site disposal. Ten truckloads of hexavalent chromium contaminated soil were removed and disposed of in a permitted facility. A small quantity of soil containing hexavalent chromium was removed to the west and south of the rinsate tank vault, and because of the proximity of the bearing wall to the east of the rinsate tank. This vault was filled with self-compacting gravel and left in place. The excavation terminated at a maximum depth of 12 feet bgs. Groundwater was not encountered during the excavation.

Soil samples were collected at various locations along the sidewalls and the bottom of the excavation to determine concentrations of hexavalent chromium present. After excavation, the hole was layered with sodium thiosulfate (a non-hazardous reducing agent), then filled with self-compacting gravel. Because of concern over maintaining structural integrity, the nearness of groundwater, and the proximate to groundwater monitoring wells, a small quantity of hexavalent chromium containing soil was left in place. The highest concentration of hexavalent chromium remaining was 738 mg/kg located 12 feet bgs. This concentration exceeds screening levels, which are protective of groundwater quality. The maximum concentration of hexavalent chromium in the soil removed was 3,110 mg/kg that was located 8 feet bgs.

CONCLUSION

The groundwater sampling report dated January 21, 2003, submitted by Targhee, reported total dissolved solids in a concentration of 3,150 mg/L from samples obtained in monitoring well number MW3. The facility is less then a half mile of the ocean, and being approximately one-and-a-half mile southeast of the Dominquez Gap (Salt Water) Barrier Project and the nearest municipal supply well. Shallow perched groundwater encountered is not of currently used for domestic purposes. Therefore, no further sampling of groundwater is required at this time. The concentrations of hexavalent chromium remaining in soil are not sufficient to further threaten groundwater quality. In addition, groundwater has been monitored, with no apparent trend in the flow of contaminants, which are at much lower concentrations for hexavalent chromium.

California Environmental Protection Agency

The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian mode to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption

For a list of simple ways to reduce demand and any year energy costs, see the tips at: http://www.sweck.ca.gov/news/schallenge.html

Mrs. Amy Fonzio-Belyea Nova Techno Corporation

-4-

October 23, 2003

This location being designated for drinking water supply according to the Regional Board's Basin Plan in addition to designations for industrial use, the protection of this resource for future use is required. There is also concern for groundwater quality down-gradient of the facility, affecting coastal waters and the Los Angeles River for which beneficial use designations include marine and wildlife habitat. There was an unauthorized discharge of wastes at the facility that was in violation of water quality objectives established in the Basin Plan and contaminated the underlying soil, and thus threaten to impair groundwater resources. However, the site is less than a quarter mile from the Dedesignation Groundwater Area, and excavation onsite in the area of the former plating tanks has been recently completed.

Based on the information provided, and on other information in our files, with the provision that information provided to this Regional Board is accurate and representative of conditions at the subject site, we have no further requirements for the soil and groundwater at this facility at this time with the above stated condition. There is a condition attached to this finding, that is, the existing groundwater monitoring wells shall be maintained until further notice by this Regional Board and the owner of the property shall notify the Regional Board of any disturbance of the groundwater monitoring wells.

A written notification must be provided to the Regional Board within 72 hours should additional contamination be encountered during any future activities at any other portions of the property and also a written notification must be submitted to this Regional Board should a change of current land use be proposed for the site.

Please contact Mr. Dixon Oriola at (213) 576-6803 or Mr. Robert Ehe at (213) 576-6740, if you have any questious regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Dennis A. Dickerson

x 70.2

Executive Officer

cc: Mr. Michael Lauffer, Office of the Chief Counsel, State Water Resources Control Board

Mr. Robert Sams, Office of the Chief Counsel, State Water Resources Control Board

Mr. John E. Van Vlear, Voss, Cook & Thel LLP

Ms. Linda Norwood, Targhee, Inc.

City of Long Beach, Dept. of Health & Human Services, Well Permits